DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 323 802 FL 018 859

AUTHOR Ruiz, J. M.
TITLE Contrastive Linguistics and the Teaching of a Second Language.
PUB DATE Apr 90
NOTE 14p.; Paper presented at the World Congress of Applied Linguistics, sponsored by International Association of Applied Linguistics (9th, Thessaloniki, Greece, April 15-21, 1990).
PUB TYPE Speeches/Conference Papers (150)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Applied Linguistics; Classroom Techniques; *Contrastive Linguistics; Educational Trends; Foreign Countries; *Instructional Effectiveness; *Interference (Language); *Research Utilization; Second Language Instruction; *Second Languages; *Theory Practice Relationship; Translation; Trend Analysis
IDENTIFIERS European Community

ABSTRACT

In the last four decades, many of the studies on contrastive linguistics have been intended for and directed to second language teachers, on the assumption that a major problem in language learning arises from interference caused by structural differences in the native and target languages. However, this effort has had little impact on the textbooks, methodology, or classroom practice of second language teaching. Factors in this failure include the following: (1) the large number of strong, attractive innovations proposed to the profession; (2) a trend toward exclusive use of the target language in instruction; and (3) use of native speakers with no knowledge of the students' native language, making contrastive analysis impossible. With the now pressing need for deeper relations between members of the European Community, translation is gaining ground and contrastive linguistics may follow suit. Contrastive linguistics can be an efficient tool to aid in second language teaching and learning, complementing other methods and approaches. (MSE)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

CONTRASTIVE LINGUISTICS AND THE TEACHING OF A SECOND LANGUAGE

Prof. J.M. Ruiz

ED323802

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
J. Ruiz

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

FL018859

Prof. J.M. Ruiz. University of Valladolid (Spain)

CONTRASTIVE LINGUISTICS AND THE TEACHING OF A SECOND LANGUAGE

To designate a comparative study of two languages different tittles have been suggested. Einar HAUGEN proposed in 1953 the term "bilingual description" [1]. Uriel WEINREICH, for his part, referred to "differential analysis", insisting on the convenience that this analysis should be made exclusively on the differences in the languages concerned [2]. HARRIS used the term "transfer grammar", which was adopted by Larr SELINKER in his doctoral dissertation A psycholinguistic study of language transfer (Georgetown Univ. 1966), and again in his article "Language transfer" (General Linguistics, 9 (1969), 67-92. In another doctoral dissertation also in Georgetown Univ. 1964, William Orr DINGWALL wrote about Diaglossic grammar and "dialinguistics". Finally the term "contrastive" prevailed when it was accepted in the field of applied Linguistics promoted by the American Center of Applied Linguistics.

In 1959 under the supervision of Charles A. FERGUSON and supported by the U.S. Office of Education a Contrastive Study Series was launched. And outstanding works were produced on the phonology and grammar of the five most important languages studied at that time in America: French, German, Italian, Russian, and Spanish, and published in Chicago University Press. The first two important contrastive studies on German and English apperared in 1962: W.G. MOULTON, The Sounds of English and German, and H.L. KUFNER, The Grammatical Structures of English and German: A Contrastive Sketch. Three years later, in 1965, R.G. STOCKWELL and J.D. BOWEN published The Sounds of English and Spanish, and the same authors with J.W. MARTIN produced The Grammatical Structures of English and Spanish. In the same year F.B. AGARD and H. J. DI PIETRO published The Sounds of English and Italian.

Since those days books and articles have appeared by the hundreds, many of the articles in different Journals such as Language Learning, International Review of Applied Linguistics, ELT Journal, etc. Only for the contrastive study of English and Spanish I have here a list of 76 books and articles published before 1973. And probably as many have been published since that date up to now.

Most of these contrastive studies were intended for and directed to teachers of languages as well as to authors of textbooks because, as A. Ferguson put it, "it was an idea and conviction held by linguists and language teachers that one of the major problems in the learning of a second language is the interferece caused by structural differences between the native language of the learner and the second language" [3].

---

1 E. Haugen, The Norwegian language in America: A study in bilingual behavior, 2 vols. Philadelphia, 1953.

2. U. Weinreich, Languages in contact: Findings and problems. New York, 1953.

3. A. Ferguson in 'Preface' to W.G. Moulton, The Sounds of Englsih and German, University of Chicago Press, 1962, p. v.

The same idea had been emphasized five years earlier by Robert Lado:

> " ... in the comparison between native and foreign language lies the key to ease or difficulty in foreign language learning ... "
>
> We assume that the student who comes in contact with a foreign language will find some features of it quite easy and others extremely difficult. Those elements that are similar to his native language will be easy for him and those elements that are different will be difficult". [1]

The idea of the usefulness of contrastive analysis was stated again in 1968 by J.B. CARROLL, when he admitted that "when there are similarities teaching can be facilitated, and when there are not teaching is slowed down and interfered with". [2]

During the 50s and the 60s the contrastive language studies were rated highly for their value in the teaching of a second language, and the main objective of these studies was, as Thomasz KRZESZOWSKI put it, "to constitue a rational basis for preparing material for teaching. For this aim it was important, first find contrasts in L_1, and second to find contrasts in L_2 reflecting meanings signalled in L_1, but by different media. [3]

This was the general belief in the 60s. "It was the heyday of structural linguistics and the pattern practice language teaching methodology, and nothing seemed of greater potential value to language teachers and learners than a comparative and contrastive description of the learner's mother tongue and the target language", as C.N. CANDLIN writes. [4] If they took into account the similarities and differences of the linguistic structures of L^1 and L^2, course designers as well as teachers and learners would be better prepared to plan their teaching and learning.

By the end of the 60s and during the 70s with an emphasis on the cognitive aspect and the communicative focus in language teaching and learning the contrastive analysis of languages seemed to have lost some of its former assurance and selfconfidence. Having admitted the importance of contrastive linguistics as part of Applied Linguistics, Gerhard NICKEL and Heinz WAGNER tried to show in 1968 what results could be expected from it in the practice of language teaching. But on the other hand they thought that contrastive linguistics was at that time still in its infancy, and consequently years of work would have to pass before the contrastive analysis of two languages could yield profitable results in the preparation of adequate teaching material. [5] James KARL for his part saw a decline in popularity in the contrastive studies, due, as he thought, to the fact that its reliability as a predictive device in language teaching was in

---

1 Robert Lado, Linguistics Across Cultures. Ann Arbor, Michigan: The University of Michigan Press, 1957, p. 1-2.

2 J.B. Carroll, "Contrstive Analysis and Interference Theory", in Report of the 19th Annual Round Table Meeting on Linguistics and Language Studies, Georgetown University Press, 1969, p. 114.

3 T. Krzeszowski, "Fundamental principles of structural contrastive studies", Glottodidactica (Poznam), 1967, 33-39.

4 C.N. Candlin, "Preface" to Carl James, Contrastive Analysis, Longman,1980, p. iii.

5 G. Nickel and K.H. Wagner, "Contrastive linguistics and language teaching", International Review of Applied Linguistics in Language Teaching (Heidelberg),

doubt, and as a remedial measure he proposed the use of Generative Grammar in contrastive studies in order to open up new possibilities of contrastive analysis,[1] something which W.O. DINGWALL had already been doing in the 60s [2], and T. KRZESZOWSKI among others did later with his Contrastive Generative Grammar (Gunter Narr, 1979).

In spite of the general decline in interest, contrastive studies produced new headways in the field. Major contrstive linguistic projects were formed and carried out between English and Servo-Croat in Zagreb, between English and Rumanian in Bucarest, between English and German in Stuugart, etc. Not only phonetic, syntactic, and semantic structures were compared, but the prosodic or suprasegmental phoneme patterns were also contrasted, as Seymor POLLOCK did in 1978 with quite new findings.[3] For instance, some prosodic characteristics of the English intonation can only be equated in Spanish with different lexico-syntactic structures. Examples:

1) How do you go from here to the University?
2) How do you go from here to the University?

Spanish: 1) ¿Cómo va usted (tú) desde aquí a la Universidad?
2) ¿Cómo se va desde aquí a la Universidad?

In English the intonation informs the listener whether the speaker is inquiring about how the listener goes to the University or how the speaker could go. In Spanish there is no such possibility in the prosodic level, and so the syntactic level has to be taken into account.

3) A Spanish teacher = Un profesor español.
4) A Spanish teacher = Un profesor de español.

In the first case a person who is Spanish and teacher is referred to. He or she is Spanish and he or she can teach music, English, or any other subject. In the second case the person in question teaches Spanish, but he or she might be English or Greek ... Two sentences again, the first indicating the nationality of the teacher, and the socond the subject which a teacher of unmentioned nationality teaches. In English the two different semantic contents are indicated by the different intonation of the same noun phrase, which in Spanish has to be split into two different noun phrases.

5) A blackbird = Un mirlo.
6) A blackbird = Un pájaro negro.

Here the lexical structure has to be changed, if the same meaning is to be expressed in the other language.

---

1 Carl James, "Deeper contrastive study", IRAL (Heidelberg), 7, 2 (1969), 83-95.

2 W.O. Dingwall, "Transformational generative grammar and contrastive analysis", Language Learning, 14. 147-160.

3 S. Pollock,"English Prosodics: A Contrastive Approach", The Modern Language Journal, Dec. 1978, 410-13.

7) Visiting relatives bored me.

8) Visiting relatives bored me.

Meaning changes with intonation. But again there is no equivalent prosodic component in Spanish, and consequently the Spanish learner of English has to learn the difference which he will only fully understand when he realizes that the equivalent in Spanish for the first is:"Unos parientes que me visitaron me aburrieron", and for the second it is: "El visitar a los familiares me aburrió". In the first instance he was visited, in the second he was the visitor.

A clear conclusion to be drawn from these facts and examples is that the teacher of English who is going to teach English intonation to Spanish speaking people should know that English prosody can carry an important semantic component which will have to be recorded in Spanish at another level, syntantic or lexical. The phonetic, syntactic, lexical, semantic components are not necessarily the same in the second language. And so the learner must be taught not only the different intonation patterns but also the change of meaning because of intonation, and this must be emphisized. This is one of the useful and important functions of the applied contrastive analysis: Trying to identify and explain the similarities and differences of two languages so that the interference between both can be avoided, and consequently the second language can be learned more quickly and efficiently.

Contrastive analysis has been used with great advantage for conducting error analysis research. Larry SELINKER in his list of nine different types of systematic errors, underlines the importance of what he calls 'the language transfer error', the one which can be directly traced back to the native language.[1] 'Transfer error', 'interference error', or 'interlingual error'. These three terms have been used, and their definition has also been subject of considerable controversy. For H.C. DULAY and N.K. BURT interference is "the automatic transfer, due to habit, of the surface structure of the first language onto the surface of the target language".[2] G. NICKEL (...next page ...

1 L. Selinker, "Interlanguage", International Review of Applied Linguistics, 10, 3, (1972), 201-31.

2 H.C. Dulay and M.K. Burt, "Creative construction in second language learning and teaching", Language Learning, (1976). Special issue 4.

~~of the target language~~". G. NICKEL on the other hand points out the convenience of distinguishing "between direct and indirect interlingual interferences. It may be that what one can call the 'macro-cause' is interlingual and what one might call the 'micro-cause' is intralingual" (1981:9).[1]

Acording to David LOTT "error analysis projects have yielded wildly contradictory results" and this due in part to differences of definition. At one extreme, Dulay and Burt stated that out of 513 errors made by Spanish children learning English, fewer than 5 per cent could be classified as interference errors. At the other extreme, Nickel observes that some comparative linguistics researchers may have attributed as many as 80 per cent of errors to interference, while'the more realistic ones' have voted for an average of about 60 per cent." (1983:258)[2].

In my own research -small selection in the two handouts- around 65 per cent of the errors are due to interference. This material, the sentences with the errors, was produced by Spanish students taking the entrance examination for the University. The students were 17 or 18 years old, and had been studying English in primary and secondary school 6 or 7 years (3 hours a week). For the examination a written text in plain English is handed to them. About 250 words for a comprehension exercise which must be also written in English. 4 questions are presented in direct relation to the meaning of the text. A fifth open question is added which consists of a topic conected more or less with the general idea of the text. If the text was, for instance, about education the student was told to "Write about his own secondary school stating his impressions about the Director or some of his teachers"(Appendix Exercise B). The student is therefore supposed to write a type of free composition in a few paragraphs or a short narrative. The students had an hour for the whole exercise of the examination in English.

Practically all the sentences of the handouts were taken from this last part of the examination papers, because it was quite evident that the number of errors was much higher than in the rest of the exercise.

NICKEL suggests that free conversation seems to produce different frequencies and qualities of error from those in written tests. (1981:12)[1]. And he also assetts that there seems to be general agreement that there is more in translations than in other types of tests. Multiple choice, for instance, produce fewer contrastive errors. Following the same line of argument, I would like to emphasize that Nickel's suggestion about free conversation can probably be transferred to free written composition, because there is a unique mental process which is the same in both activities: the student or learner of the target language is, in most cases, thinking in his native tongue and tries to speak in the target language through a process very similar to the one followed in a translation exercise. Consequently the interference of his/her native language

1 G. Nickel, "Aspects of error analysis: 'errare humanum est'", AILA Bulletin, 29 (1981), 1-27.

2 David Lott, "Analysing and counteracting interference errors", ELT Journal

is more likely to take place than in any other type of exercise in which practically the target language is the only vehicle.

In the given examples of the handouts (Cf. Appendix A,B,C) there are clear and unmistakable cases of interlingual or transfer errors, and in some instances so much so that it will be difficult even to guess the meaning for someone who does not understand Spanish. For instance B. n.4: "Insects go to the countries where it do good time". The writer in the underlined words has composed a nice Spanish sentence but with English words: "Los insectos van a los paises donde hace buen tiempo". And probably he was very happy with the sentence because he did not forget the "it", which is not in Spanish, and there is no need of it. But of course, he forgot at the same time that in standard English "it" goes with "does", not with "do". What he wanted to say was 'per se' very simple: "Insects go to the countries where the weather is good", or ... to countries in which there is a good weather". But 'per accidens' the sentence is impossible for him to produce if he has not previously learnt the contrast between the two sentences, the one in Spanish, his mother tongue, and the one he is trying to learn, English.

Or, if we take sentence A. 1: "I haven't got the gust of meet him", and know Spanish, we are sure that he is not complaining about the shortage or need of any violent rush of wind, or outburst of feeling, but he is trying to say again a very simple thing: "No he tenido el gusto de saludarle", literally: "I haven't had the pleasure of meeting him". He thought that 'gust' was provably the only way and the easiest to say 'gusto' in English; and since in Spanish the verb form after the preposition is the verb stem he did the same in English.

There are of course many types of interference, all of which would appear if we made a detailed analysis of each of the interlingual errors, more than a hundred that appear in the handouts. If we take, for instance, the first sentence B. 1: a) The used instead of Ø morpheme before plural nouns; b) Adjective Spanish following the noun instead of preceding it. Both are syntactic structures in Spanish, and have been transferred into English by the student. It is not so clear, however, if can to come, wrong form after modal verb, is an intralingual on interlingual error, or both.

In the second sentence B. 2, "Aeroplanes can be used how a solution", the error is obvious. The wider lexical value of the Spanish como (How/as) has caused interference, at least that is what probably the student thought; exactly the same as the one who wrote sentence A. 3: "He describes the superior how fine old man", or in C. 15 "How them" (for "as they"), and C. 22 "how speak the young people" (for "as young people speak"). Properly speaking, if the student knew well his mother tongue both in the written and in the spoken form, he should have known that there are two different comos, one with stress in the written and in the spoken form cómo, and this is always how in English, and the other

one como unstressed with the same functional meaning as the English as or like. And so the ignorance of his own language lead the poor man to commit an innocent mistake.

In the sentence B. 3 we have five or six errors, depending on the way we count. The first is the article used instead of Ø morpheme again. The second is the use of a preposition for a direct object 'kill to insects', repeated again at the end of the sentence 'killed at the plants'. The third is the omission of 'it' as subject for 'was difficult', and again the omission of 'to' for the verb 'know'. And finally the intrusion of an 's' to give an appropiate appearance of plural form to the adjective 'different'. And we can generously forgive him his 'formulas'. All the cases are reproduced from the syntactic structures of Spanish. We could perhaps make a qualification: If the student had known better the Spanish syntactic rules for the use or omission of the preposition 'a' for the direct object in a sentence, he would not have made this double error.

For a detailes analysis we could also follow the three general criteria which David LOTT proposses [1] to categorize interlingual errors.

I Overextension of analogy: The student misuses a vocabulary item because the item shares features, whether phonological, orthographic, semantic, or syntactic, with an item in the native language. Examples:

a. In A. 2 'He show mathematic', 'show' is used instead of 'teach' because of the wider semantic reference of Spanish 'enseñar', which means both 'teach' and 'show'. An English speaking student would probably have the same problem with the Spanish 'saber - conocer' or the German 'wissen - kennen', all of which are simply 'to know' in English.

b. In C. 17 'When he was small', 'small' is used instead of 'young', because in Spanish 'pequeño', which means small, is commonly used for a little or young boy.

c. In B. 6, A. 11, C. 18 'yours', 'your', 'your' are used respectively instead of 'their', 'her', and 'their', because the writers are transfering the Spanish 'su' which can be 'your', 'his', 'her', 'their'. When the student uses 'yours' in the first case, B. 6, he is not thinking about the pronoun but about the plural of the adjective 'your' > 'yours', because of the Spanish derivation 'su' > 'sus'.

d. Phonetic and orthographic similarities and the wider semantic reference of Spanish 'pasar' induce the student to produce sentence A. 4, "In our school we pass it very well", from the Spanish "lo pasamos bien", meaning "we spent our time very well", > "we had a good time" > "we enjoyed ourselves".

e. In B. 5 "People passed a lot of hungry and thirsty" presents a similar

problem to the one of the previous example. "Pasar hambre" in Spanish means "to pass" or "to go through hunger and thirst" > "to be or to go hungry and thirsty". In Spanish "pasar hambre" and "tener hambre", transitive verbs + direct object (noun) is transferred to transitive/intransitive? verb + adjective. The student probably takes for nouns the English adjectives 'hungry' and 'thirsty'. Or perhaps he just equates not only semantically but also syntactically the Spanish 'tener hambre' with the English 'to be hungry'.

II Transfer of structure: The student makes a grammatical error because he is following the rules of his native tongue instead of the rules of the target language. Examples:

a. Position of adjectives after the noun: C. 3: 'Words very bad'; C. 10: 'is a language enough bad'; C.20: 'a language a few poor'; C. 21: 'enough different'.

b. Plural form for adjectives: B.3: 'differents insects'; A.10: 'polites matters'; C.1: 'differents kinds'; C.19: 'words quite differents'.

c. Place of negation: B.7: 'To fight insects today no is a problem'; C.12: 'If a child not speaks with people ...'

d. Double negation: A.11: 'We don't understand nothing'.

e. Preposition for direct object: A.6: 'I don't know very well to teacher of Math'; A.7: 'He read to Platon (Plato)'.

f. An adverbial adjunct for a sentence: C.17: 'the education gives of small'. (from the Spanish 'la educación que se le dió de pequeño'). 'De pequeño' means 'when he was a child or a little boy'.

g. Use of that clause instead of pronoun and a bare infinitive: A.5: "He does that we smile in class", for "He makes us laugh in class". In Spanish there are two different structures: a) "El hace que nos riamos en clase", and b) "El nos hace reir en clase", with a slightly different semantic reference. The student used the verb 'does' because there is no make/do distinction in Spanish, since for both there is only one word 'hacer'.

And this introduces us into the third category of errors:

III Interlingual/Intralingual Error:

a) The student makes an error of grammar because a grammatical distinction does not exist in his native language. Ex. C.12: 'he will can never'. No distinction in Spanish for the future form of the verb between modal and non-modal ver

b) The student makes an error in a vocabulary item because a lexical distinction does not exist in the native tongue. Ex.: the already quoted: "show/teach", "make/do", or "enough/quite" (C.21, C.10).

To go on with a detailed analysis of all the errors would be extremely dious and unnecessary for our purpose here. What becomes clear is that it is possible and easy to trace the source of the interlingual errors, but only under one condition, that the teacher know the native language of the student. And it also seems clear that if the source of the illness is discovered it will be much easier to find the appropriate remedy for it. And therefore once the errors and their causes are known the remedial strategies should be applied.

CONCLUSION

Contrastive linguistics studies have already been going on for almost four decades, with ups and downs acording to the general orientation of linguistics at a given moment, and quite considerable research has been produced. But one is tempted to believe that this massive production of theoretical work has had very little impact on text books, teaching methodology, and especially in the language teaching practice. One has the impression that many of the discoveries of 'Applied Linguistics' have not been 'applied', at least sufficiently, that the practical side of applied linguistics, and in our case, contrastive linguistics has fallen far behind the theory.

If we make an analysis of the situation we could perhaps point out a few causes leading to the present state of the art. First, with so many strong innovating tendencies (structuralist, behaviourist, mentalist-cognitive, functional, notional, notional-functional, communicative, and so on ...), and all of them in fashion at a certain time, the humble art of contrastive linguistics, as has happened also with translation, was partially considered as a second class, a 'poor man's ' lot. On the other hand the tremendous emphasis given to the direct or natural method in which only and exclusibly the target language was supposed to be used encouraged publishers and course book writers to produce standard books for worldwide use, open to all the different speach communities in the world, and therefore unable to pay attention to any particular language group and to any contrastive approach. And finally to put into practice or to reinforce the natural method tendency the fashionable habit was born of employing native speakers of the target language without any knowledge of the mother tongue of the students, making it therefore impossible to apply any contrastive approach to language teaching. As a corollary of the strong tendency even the non-native speakers of the target language felt themselves compelled to follow suit and do the same.

Now again, perhaps out of the pressing need for a deeper relationship between the different members of the European Community, translation - until recently the 'black beast' of language teachers - is gaining ground and a new impetus, and it is to be expected that contrastive linguistics applied to language teaching will follow the same path. For both, teachers, fluent in two languages, are needed as well as new material with the clear purpose of taking advantage of contrastive linguistics.

I firmly believe in the efficiency of contrastive linguistics, "if applied" to teaching and learning of a second language, not of course as a method in itself, but as an efficient complementary means of saving a great quantity of time in learning simple things which seem complicated because of the interference of the native tongue, and of avoiding obnoxious errors.

This new consciousness is coming into its own since facts, if not theories, compel us to admit what Carl JAMES resumes in a short sentence: "whatever Method one subscribes to, one will always view the learner's possession of the L_1 as a powerful factor to be reckoned with" (1986:158)[1]. And I fully agree with David ATKINSON (1987:247) [2] when he writes "that although the mother tongue is not a suitable basis for a methodology, it has, at all levels, a variety of roles to play which are at present consistently undervalued, for reasons which are for the most part suspect. And to ignore the mother tongue in a monolingual classroom is almost certainly to teach with less than maximum efficiency".

It was perhaps the same idea, worded certainly in a less academic manner, that a student wanted to convey, about the exclusively natural method his/her teacher was using. It was a harsh lesson for the teacher who perhaps was more interested in showing what she knew than in teaching what the student did not know. Here is what he or she wrote (and you have it in A.11):

> "My teacher of English is stupid; she talks and talks but everybody plays to do something in your class because we don't understand nothing".

Valladolid, April 8, 1990

José M. Ruiz

A I L A 9 0

---

2 D. Atkinson, "The mother tongue in the classroom: a neglected resource?", ELT Journal, 41/4 (October 1987), 241-247.

1 C. James, Contrastive Analysis, Longman 1986 (First published 1980), pág. 158.

APPENDIX

A

The University entrance examination. Valladolid (Spain), June, 1988. In answer to question 5: "Write about your own Secondary School stating your impressions about the Director or some of your teachers", here is what some students wrote.

1. I haven't got the gust of meet him.
2. I was a lot of content with him.
3. He describes the superior how fine old man.
4. In our School we pass it very well.
5. He does that we smile in class.
6. I don't know very well to teacher of Math.
7. He read to Platon.
8. He don't know to explain.
9. Some teacher must to help a few more because they help you a few.
10. He show matematic and of polites matters.
11. My teacher of English is stupid; she talks and talks but everybody plays to do something in your class because we don't understand nothing.

B

The University entrance examination. Valladolid (Spain), September, 1988. The subject of the written text was on "plagues", and the students had to answer the following question: "Describe some of these problems in recent times.

1. The men Spanish thought that this plague can to come here.
2. Aeroplanes can be used how a solution.
3. The men can't kill to insects because for man xxx was difficult xxx know the formulas to kill many differents insects. The insects killed at the plants.
4. Insects go to the countries where it do good time.
5. People passed a lot of hungry and thirsty.
6. The men couldn't get the insects don't dead because yours armies didn't be very efficcently.
7. To fight insects today no is a problem.
8. The insect plague would eating a persons.
9. The aeroplanes can to make to dead the insects.
10. The farms work all year the grounds for can live.

C

The University entrance examination. Valladolid (Spain), September, 1989. Here is what some students wrote about the following question: "What is your opinion about the language used by the young people, adults, T.V., etc. in Spain today?".

1. I think it's positive to be differents kinds of language.
2. The young people with their own language try to be more listen for the adult people
3. The children spend a lot of time watching T.V. I think this is bad because in T.V. show films which have so often words very bad.
4. Many adults unknow a lot of forms of language.
5. The young people know the new forms of language better because the society had changed and the young people had been who had changed it.
6. There are groups that they speaks defferently.
7. The child learn the language that his parents teaches him.
8. He don't learn the language by instruction, he learn it by the influence of events.
9. In order to the language of T.V. I believe it could be less technic, and of this way all understand.
10. The language used by the young people is an language enough bad.
11. The language used by the young people is special, because have words that the young people is inventing, are rare words, with a signification rare.
12. If a child not speaks with people he will can never to be a member in a society.
13. The adults in Spain speak bad, but they speak best than the young people, although the adults went at school few time.
14. In Spain people speak very much and very bad. Now the people don't speak how befor
15. The children learn before going to school, the most important things, as talk. They learn it of their parents. The child speaks how them.
16. A person that can't talk is very difficult that can relationated with the less members of a society.
17. The child has expereience of when he was small, the education gives of small.
18. People living far of your house. People speak everytime worst.
19. The words use by the young people are quite differents than the words use by adults, Their language is quite different of my language. It is funny when adults try to speak the "young people language".
20. The T.V. has a language a few poor.
21. T.V. language it's enough different of people language.
22. T.V. is tried to speak how speak the young people. You give a language seemed.
23. We can think that in line 22 is too the answer of this ask.